01		
02		
03		
04		
05		
06	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
07	AT SEATTLE	
08	PAEAIMULI LAPOTA,	) ) CASE NO. C11-0821-JLR
09	Petitioner,	) )
10	v.	) ) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
11	ERIC HOLDER, Attorney General of the United States, et al.,	)
12	Respondents.	) )
13	- respondents.	
14	On May 13, 2011, petitioner Paeaimuli Lapota, proceeding through counsel, filed a	
15	Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, a Writ of Mandamus, and Complaint for Declaratory Relief	
16	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, challenging his detention by the United States Immigration and	
17	Customs Enforcement ("ICE"), and his March 24, 2011, order of removal. (Dkt. No. 1.) On	
18	June 15, 2011, however, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order Dismissing	
19	Habeas Petition and Complaint along with documentation which indicates that petitioner was	
20	released from immigration custody on May 31, 2011, and his order of removal was rescinded on	
21	June 7, 2011. (Dkt. No. 9, Exs. A and B.) The parties agree that this matter has become moot	
22	and may be dismissed with prejudice and without award of fees or costs to either party. <i>Id</i> .	
	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PAGE -1	

For a federal court to have jurisdiction, "an actual controversy must exist at all stages of the litigation." Biodiversity Legal Foundation v. Badgley, 309 F.3d 1166, 1173 (9th Cir. 2002). "When a controversy no longer exists, the case is moot." *Id.* Because petitioner is no longer in immigration custody and his removal order was rescinded, the Court finds that petitioner's habeas petition is moot and should be dismissed with prejudice and without award of fees or costs to either party. See, e.g., Cooney v. Edwards, 971 F.2d 345, 346 (9th Cir. 1992)(holding that the District Court properly dismissed plaintiff's claims that had become either moot or unripe). A proposed Order accompanies this Report and Recommendation. DATED this 16th day of June, 2011. Mary Alice Theiler United States Magistrate Judge